

## REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicant submits the following remarks and seeks reconsideration of the application. In this response, no claims are canceled, Claims 14-16 are added, and Claims 1-13 are amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-16 are pending.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE".

### **I. Objections to the Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the specification because the application does not contain an Abstract of the Disclosure. In response, Applicant has provided an Abstract of the Disclosure. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

### **II. Objections to the Claims**

Claims 6-13 are objected to as being in improper form. This matter is believed to be addressed by the claim amendments submitted herewith. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to Claims 6-13 is respectfully requested.

### **III. Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

In the Office Action, Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Harvey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,360,729). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is axiomatic that to anticipate a claim, every element of the claim must be disclosed within a single reference. Thus, if even one feature of Claim 1 is not found in Harvey, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 1 and its dependent Claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Harvey be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that Harvey fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in the amended Claim 1.

In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that the “module” set forth in Claim 1 corresponds to cable sections 20a, 20b, 20c and 20d of Harvey (the section 20c shown in figure 7 being used as an example by the Examiner). It appears that the Examiner considers that the connectors 10g and 10h associated to this cable section 20c are also part of the “module.” Such interpretation of the device of Harvey is improper, in particular because each of the casings 12 of Harvey is associated not to one track, but on the contrary to a plurality of tracks.

As described in the background section of the specification, systems for acquiring geophysical data are configured according to one of two architectures: (1) monotrack architecture (shown in Figure 1); and (2) multitrack architecture (shown in Figure 2).

The module claimed in Claim 1 recites a monotrack architecture in which each casing is individually linked to one track.

In contrast, the device of Harvey relates to a multitrack architecture in which each casing 12 is linked to multiple tracks. As seen by referring to Figure 7 of Harvey, each casing 12 is linked to eight tracks. Consequently, the device of Harvey suffers the

drawbacks associated with the multitrack architecture as described in the background section of the specification.

For the purpose of clarification, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite that the casing is individually linked to one track. As to the amended Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the casing 12 of Harvey which is linked to multiple tracks in no way teaches or suggests each casing individually linked to one track as recited by Applicant.

In the Office Action, the Examiner further asserts that neither the Applicant's specification nor drawings clearly distinguish the difference between (1) an adapter to effect an electrical link and (2) a connector suitable for being coupled to a complementary connector. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In accordance with one embodiment, a connector 30 is provided at each end of a module 40 to couple with a complementary connector of a neighboring module (see Figure 3 and page 11, lines 16-20 of the specification). And, as seen by referring to Figure 4, the adapter (140a, 140b) is configured to be fixed to a casing and to effect an electrical link with the processing means housed in the casing. As such, the adapter is an entity which is distinct in itself, and in particular different from the connector.

In this regard, Applicant respectfully submits that the "module" 20c shown in Figure 7 of Harvey in no way teaches or suggests two cable sections, wherein each cable section comprises at a first end, a connector suitable for being coupled to a complementary connector and at a second end, an adapter configured to be fixed to a casing and to effect an electrical link with the processing means housed in the casing as claimed in Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Harvey and requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1. Dependent Claims 2-13 are submitted as not being anticipated by Harvey at least for the reasons given in support of their base Claim 1.

**IV. New Claims**

Applicant respectfully submits that New Claims 14-16 are supported by the original disclosure. As to New Claims 14-15, Applicant incorporates the prior arguments with respect to their base Claim 1. As to New Claim 16, Applicant respectfully submits that Harvey fails to teach or suggest a plurality of casings linked in series by cable sections, in which each of the casings is individually linked to a respective one of tracks. At least for this reason, Applicant is of the opinion that New Claims 14-16 are allowable.

## **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



---



Walter T. Kim; Reg. No. 42,731

Dated: February 7, 2003

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(310) 207-3800

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited as First Class Mail, with sufficient postage, with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to: Box: Amendments, Non-Fee, Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on February 7, 2003.

  
Linda D'Elia  
February 7, 2003

**Attachment: Version With Markings To Show Changes Made**

**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

**IN THE ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE**

**The following Abstract of the Disclosure is provided on a separate sheet following the claims as attached hereto.**

**--ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE**

A module is described for acquiring geophysical signals. The module includes at least one casing which is individually linked to one track. Each casing houses a processor which operates to digitize the geophysical signals. The module further includes two cable sections associated with each casing. Each cable section includes at a first end, a connector suitable for being coupled up to a complementary connector, and at a second end, an adapter configured to be fixed to a casing and to effect an electrical link with the processor housed in the casing.--

**IN THE SPECIFICATION**

On page 1, after line 2, the following heading has been inserted:

**BACKGROUND**

On page 1, before line 3, the following sub-heading has been inserted:

**Field of the Invention**

On page 1, before line 7, the following sub-heading has been inserted:

**Description of the Related Art**

On page 7, before line 23, the following heading has been inserted:

**SUMMARY**